



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/560,469	04/28/2000	JOSEPH A FERNANDO	UNF-9058-A	3786

23575 7590 07/21/2003

JOSEPH G CURATOLO, ESQ.
RENNER KENNER GREIVE BOBAK TAYLOR & WEBER
24500 CENTER RIDGE ROAD, SUITE 280
WESTLAKE, OH 44145

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

TRAN, HIEN THI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1764	(2)

DATE MAILED: 07/21/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/560,469	FERNANDO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hien Tran	1764	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 May 2003.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 28-40 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) 1-46 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>7,8,9</u> . | 6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <i>See Continuation Sheet</i> . |

Continuation of Attachment(s) 6). Other: The status of the parent application should be updated.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election of group I, claims 1-27, 41-44, in Paper No. 11 is acknowledged.

Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

2. Claims 28-40, 45-46 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in Paper No. 11.

Drawings

3. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

Specification

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

On page 19, line 19 it is unclear as to what is intended by "flange 16 area".

Appropriate correction is required.
5. The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 8-9, 19-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 8, the language of the claim is directed to method limitation which renders the claim vague and indefinite as it is unclear as to what structural limitation applicants are attempting to recite. See claims 9, 19-25 likewise.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

10. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

11. Claims 1-27, 41-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Robinson et al (5,580,532) in view of JP 07-286514 and GB 1,481,133 (Johnson et al).

Robinson et al discloses a device 10 for the treatment of exhaust gas comprising:
a housing 12 and a fragile structure 18 mounted within the housing 12,
a support element 20 disposed between the housing 12 and the fragile structure 18, said support element comprising an integral, non-expanding sheet of ceramic fibers containing alumina and silica, said fibers having an average diameter of 1-10 microns.

The apparatus of Robinson et al is substantially the same as that of the instant claims, but is silent as to whether the fiber may be heat treated to crystalline form as claimed.

However, it appears that the claim is a product-by-process claim and when the patentability of a product-by-process claim is determined, the relevant inquiry is whether the product itself is patentable. *In re Brown*, 459 F.2d 531, 535, 173 USPQ 685, 688 (CCPA 1972). If a product is the same as or would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art from a product of the prior art, the product is unpatentable even though the prior art product was made by different process. *In re Thorpe*, 777 F.2d 695, 697, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985). Since the product of the instant claim is substantial the same as that of Robinson et al, it is unpatentable even though the product of Robinson et al was made by different process.

In any event, JP 07-286514 discloses provision of a ceramic fiber mat disposed between the catalyst and a housing in which the ceramic fibers have been heat treated at temperature of

Art Unit: 1764

1300 °C in 4 hours to produce a crystalline structure having 0-10 % crystallinity as determined by x-ray diffraction. JP 07-286514 is silent as to the specific crystallite size thereof.

However, since in JP 07-286514, the ceramic fiber is heat treated within the temperature range and time as that of the instant claim, the crystallite size of the heat treated ceramic fiber will be the same as that of the instant claim.

Furthermore, GB 1,481,133 discloses the conventionality of providing ceramic fibers used for thermal insulation in which the ceramic fibers have been heat treated at temperature of 950 to 1050 °C from 10 minutes to one hour to produce a crystalline structure having crystalline size of less than 200 Å.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to heat the ceramic fibers in the catalytic converter of Robinson et al to form the crystalline structure with the specific percentage of crystallinity as taught by JP 07-286514 and with the specific crystallite size as taught GB 1,481,133, if not inherent in JP 07-286514, since crystalline form of the ceramic fibers provides good resiliency which is required in mounting the ceramic fibers into the catalytic device.

The specific pressure of the support element in the modified apparatus of Robinson et al would be inherent therein. Furthermore, it should be noted that pressure is not a part of the device and therefore is of no patentable moment in apparatus claims.

With respect to claims 41-44, the use of needle punching to hold the ceramic fiber mat is well known in the art as evidenced by JP 07-286514.

Conclusion

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hien Tran whose telephone number is 308-4253. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday from 7:30AM-6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Calderola can be reached on (703) 308-6824. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 308-0661.

Hien Tran

Hien Tran
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1764

HT
July 18, 2003